



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF THEOLOGY

Volume II

JANUARY 1898

Number 1

THE LOGIA OF BEHNESA

OR

THE NEW "SAYINGS OF JESUS."

By EDWIN A. ABBOTT,
London, England.

I. *The questions suggested.*—In the little Egyptian hamlet of Behnesa, where once stood Oxyrhynchus, 120 miles south of Cairo, there has been discovered a leaf from a papyrus book containing a number of sentences prefaced with the words "Saith Jesus." It is but $3\frac{3}{4}$ inches broad, and, in its present condition, $5\frac{3}{4}$ inches long, but was perhaps originally a little longer, as it has been torn at the bottom. At the top of what appears to be the front page are the words, "and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote that is in thy brother's eye."¹ At the bottom of what appears to be the back page are traces of a clause containing the words "thou hearest," preceded by a version of another well-known sentence: "Saith Jesus, A city built on the top of a high hill, and stablished, can neither fall nor be hid."² Before this comes the proverb about "a prophet in his own country."³ But wedged in between these canonical sayings come unfamiliar, mysterious utterances, telling us that we must "fast the world" and "sabbatize the Sabbath;" that Jesus found "all men drunken⁴ and none athirst;" and that he will be

¹ Luke 6:42; Matt. 7:5.

² Cf. Matt. 5:14.

³ Matt. 13:57; Mark 6:4; Luke 4:24; John 4:44.

⁴ Or "drinking" (*μεθύοντες*).

present with his disciples when they "cleave the tree"⁵ and "raise the stone." Canonical or uncanonical, all the sentences are introduced with the words "Saith Jesus."⁶

The first question is, Did Jesus really say these words? In the next place, supposing them to be genuine, how can we ascertain their precise meaning, and is the Greek to be regarded as a translation and interpreted accordingly? Again, are they to be interpreted literally or metaphorically? And were they addressed, like the Sermon on the Mount,⁷ not to the "multitude" at large, but to Christ's disciples, and especially to those charged with an apostolic commission?

II. *The similarity of the Logia to the Sermon on the Mount.*—We have seen that two of the Logia are found in Matthew's Sermon on the Mount. This suggests the thought that there may have been many traditional forms of that discourse, of which Matthew has given one, and our author another. The front page of the papyrus leaf is numbered (by a later hand than that of the actual scribe) "eleven." Now, a little book of which this was the eleventh page (allowing for a line, perhaps, lost at the bottom) would contain about enough lines to take the reader back from our first Logion (Matthew's saying about "the mote and the beam") to the first Beatitude, "Blessed are the poor in spirit." This resemblance in length is worth noting. We have no ground for supposing that the preceding leaves were precisely similar to the preceding parts of the Sermon in wording, or exactly parallel in arrangement of thoughts; but, so far as it goes, the evidence supports the view that we have before us a leaf from an ancient, cheap, and portable copy of a version

⁵ "The tree" (ξύλον). Not "the wood" (see note 50, pp. 14-15).

⁶ Λέγει Ἰησοῦς. Theoretically it is possible that each sentence might conclude with these words, like "saith the Lord" in some of the prophets, e. g., Malachi 3:12, 13; 4:3. But it is most probable that they are used as an introduction.

⁷ So at least Matthew (5:1-2) leads us to suppose: "And seeing the multitudes, he went up *into the mountain*: and, when he had sat down, *his disciples* came unto him: and he opened his mouth and taught them." It is not perhaps so in Luke (6:17): "And he came down with them and stood *on a level place*, and a great *multitude of his disciples*." But even there a distinction may perhaps be discerned between (Luke 6:19) "the multitude" that sought to "touch him" and (*ibid.*, 20) "his disciples," on whom the blessing was pronounced.

of the Lord's sayings to his disciples on the lines followed by Matthew in his Sermon on the Mount.

In one respect, it is true, our Logia differ from the Sermon. The latter professes to be a single discourse; the former, to be a collection of single sayings. But the difference is not so great as it appears. Luke arranges many of the passages in the Sermon in quite a different order, and assigns to many of them later places in the gospel history, defining the special occasion that gave rise to each and the circumstances in which each was uttered. That is to say, Luke did not regard the sayings in the Sermon as being placed in their right order. From his point of view, therefore, many of the sayings in the Sermon might have been regarded as no less disconnected than those in our Logia. "Matthew leaves out the words 'Saith Jesus,' the author of the Logia puts them in, that is all the difference"—might be the conclusion arrived at by some who adopt as historical Luke's rearrangement of Matthew's Sermon.

I am not here maintaining that Luke is right and Matthew wrong. The point is that a collection of Logia detached in *form* (*e. g.*, by a preparatory formula such as "Jesus saith," or "I say unto you") may be pervaded by a continuous thread of thought. It is quite obvious that there is such a distinct unity and logical connection in portions, at all events, of Matthew's Sermon. Similarly, other collectors of Logia may have written versions of the Sermon on the Mount, or of the teachings of Jesus, in which, though each saying is introduced by an identical preface, such as "Jesus saith," one definite purpose may pervade the whole. And this conclusion must influence our interpretation of the new Logia.

Nor ought we to be much prejudiced against the expectation of this continuous clew by the well-known words of Luke's preface concerning the labors of his predecessors. "Many," he says, had "taken in hand to compile⁸ a narrative⁹ concerning those matters" which were fully established among Christians; and consequently he, too, having followed things up to their source, resolved to write something for the benefit of Theophi-

⁸ ἀνατάξασθαι.

⁹ διηγήσιν.

lus: but he emphatically says that what he wrote should be "in (chronological) order," and he implies that his method of writing would enable Theophilus to ascertain the exact meaning and truth concerning the words wherein he had been "instructed as a catechumen."¹⁰ Our great debt to Luke for his attempt at historical arrangement must not prevent us from recognizing that in many instances, where he differs from Matthew and Mark in his arrangement of the words and deeds of Jesus, he does not seem to be successful. Placed in Matthew's order and illustrated by Matthew's context, several passages in the Sermon on the Mount are more intelligible than in the rearranged order of Luke. The same may be true of our Logia. We must be prepared to find in them, as in Matthew's Sermon, a thread of thought connecting the first saying about "the mote" with the last saying about the "city on the hill," and running through the intervening sayings in such a way as to help us to arrive at their meaning.

III. *Other collections of Logia.*—The words above quoted from the preface to Luke's gospel indicate that many compositions concerning Christ's words and deeds were current in his days. When we put ourselves in the position of an early Christian, we must feel at once that it could not have been otherwise. Luke's words appear at first sight to refer principally to historical "narratives;" but the word so translated does not exclude anecdotes or collections of sayings; and his implied condemnation of their want of "order" makes it highly probable that he is referring largely, not to gospels such as the gospel of the Egyptians, or that of the Hebrews, but to collections of Christ's sayings such as are found in the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, the Logia of Behnesa, and, we must add, discourses similar to Matthew's Sermon on the Mount

Nothing was more certain than that, when our Lord's words were first committed to writing, manuals would appear containing his doctrine on special subjects, such as prayer, fasting, one's duty to neighbors, one's duty to enemies, and so on. Probably there were also manuals of prophecy, showing how

¹⁰ κατηχήθης.

Jesus was proved to be the Messiah, and perhaps manuals of Christ's parables; but, above all, the pious Christian would prize his collection of "The Comfortable Sayings of Christ,"¹¹ the manual that contained the whole duty of a Christian. Passages similar to those in Matthew's Sermon on the Mount are quoted by Clement of Rome, Polycarp, and Clement of Alexandria, with such differences from Matthew's and Luke's versions, and with such agreement among the quoters, as to make it highly probable that the two former are quoting from some manual of this sort, and probable that the later Clement is not imitating his more ancient namesake, but quoting from an identical or similar source. In reproducing the short moral maxims of Jesus, writers sometimes use the preface found in the Acts, where St. Paul bids us "remember *the words of the Lord Jesus, how he said*, It is more blessed to give than to receive;" sometimes they simply use the word "saith."¹² The author of the Logia of Behnesa uses a novel form, almost non-occurrent in the gospels,¹³ "Saith Jesus." It is, however, frequent in some of the Old Testament prophecies in the form "Saith the Lord." Perhaps the compiler of this little book desired to suggest to his readers that in these "Comfortable Words" Jesus still speaks to us, as if face to face, in the present.¹⁴

IV. *Are these Logia a translation?* — Papias, our earliest authority for facts bearing on the authorship and composition of the canonical gospels, tells us that the apostle Matthew compiled the Logia in the Hebrew language, and that people interpreted them severally as best they could.¹⁵ It has been perhaps too generally assumed in modern times that the "Hebrew" here meant could not be the Hebrew of the Scriptures, inasmuch

¹¹ "Comfortable" in St. Paul's sense, *i. e.*, strengthening and stimulating to action.

¹² Mostly, I think, *φησίν*.

¹³ Perhaps the only exception is John 13:31. The peculiarity of it is that λέγει immediately precedes Ἰησοῦς without the article.

¹⁴ The remark of Justin Martyr (I, *Apol.*, § 14) concerning the shortness and point of the words of the Lord would apply better to such collections as the Sermon on the Mount, the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, and the Logia of Behnesa, than to the more rhetorical attacks on the Pharisees, the Parables, etc.

¹⁵ Euseb., *H. E.*, iii, 39, Ματθαῖος μὲν οὖν Ἑβραϊδὶ διαλέκτῳ τὰ λόγια συνεγράψατο, ἡμῆνευσε δ' αὐτὰ ὡς ἦν δυνατὸς ἕκαστος.

as that was not a spoken language. But on reflection, does it not appear antecedently probable that when pious Jews undertook at last—after long delays caused by anticipation of the coming of the Lord—to set forth in writing the doctrine that had been hitherto orally taught concerning the words and deeds of the Lord Jesus, they would regard no language as fit for the purpose except the Hebrew, perhaps the later Hebrew, of the books of the Old Testament? Passing from tradition to Scripture, they would naturally pass from the language of tradition to the language of Scripture, and this might seem to them to be necessarily Hebrew. This, too, would explain the language of Papias implying early varieties of interpretation. Had the language been a spoken one, such as Aramaic, there would have been comparatively little scope for divergency; but if the language was that of the Hebrew Scriptures, which were themselves “interpreted” to the congregation of Jewish synagogues, then all becomes clear. The first book of Christian Logia, when set forth as “Scripture,” was written in the language of the books of the Old Testament, and, from the first, interpreted—as the latter were interpreted, even to Jews, much more to Gentiles. If this was the case, we must be prepared to find in our Logia such divergencies, or peculiarities, as may be explained by reference to a Hebrew original.¹⁶

¹⁶For example, in his account of St. Peter’s denials, Mark, and Mark alone, gives our Lord’s prediction in these words (Mark 14:30): “Before the cock crow *twice*, thou shalt deny me thrice.” Why do the other three gospels (which can be proved to be later) agree in rejecting the word “twice,” which adds much to the point of the narrative, if it is to be regarded as a detailed miraculous prediction? An answer will be supplied if we can show that the textual phenomena point to some brief and obscure original Hebrew idiom which has been literally translated, but wrongly arranged, by Mark.

Such a passage occurs in Job 33:29, where the literal Hebrew is “All these things *twice thrice*”—meaning “twice, nay, thrice” (a very common Hebrew abbreviation)—“God worketh.” The LXX have “All these things *ways three* God worketh.” The cause of their mistake is this: The Hebrew “twice” is the dual of the word meaning “time,” “occasion,” etc. Even with vowel points there is scarcely any difference between the dual, which means “times two,” (p a^e m a i m), and the plural, which means “times” (p^e â m î m). Unpointed, the two words are identical, פַּעַמִּים. Hence the LXX found in the Hebrew the meaning “times thrice or three” (“thrice” and “three” being identical in the Hebrew), which appeared to make better sense in the shape “occasions, or ways, three.” The same explanation applies here. If the orig-

V. *Fasting the world*.—Applying these considerations to the Logia of Behnesa, we pass over the canonical one that heads the list, simply asking the reader to note that its tenor leads us to anticipate also in the rest a warning to the Lord's disciples to prepare themselves to help others. They are to cast out their own "beam" in order that they may cast out their brother's "mote."

The next Logion is this: "Saith Jesus, unless ye *fast the world* (νηστεύσητε τὸν κόσμον) ye shall verily not find the kingdom of God, and unless ye *sabbatize* the *Sabbath* (σαββατίσητε τὸ σάββατον) ye shall not see the Father." Clement of Alexandria is the only Greek writer at present known to have combined the verb "fast" with the noun "world."¹⁷ But he uses it with the *genitive*, "fast *from the world*," a brief but clear form of saying "fast, or abstain from the passions of the world." If Clement's phrase was known to the writer, we should be reduced to the supposition that the latter corrupted and obscured what was originally excellent Greek and perfectly clear. Far more probably Clement has adopted and adapted the saying of Behnesa. If so, what was the precise meaning of the Logion?

inal Hebrew was "Before the cock crow *times-two* [*nay*] *three* shalt thou deny me," Mark might translate literally and punctuate after "times-two," with this result, "Before the cock crow *twice, three* [*times*] shalt thou deny me." Matthew and the later evangelists, taking the Hebrew word to be plural (not dual), punctuated after "crow," rendering the whole thus, "Before the cock crow, *times three* (*i. e.*, thrice) shalt thou deny me." The deviation of the later evangelists from the original Greek tradition was, therefore, probably caused by a reminiscence, not wholly accurate, of the original Hebrew, and by a sense that Mark's literal version had failed to reproduce the spirit of it. The original appears to have been, not an arithmetical prediction at all, but, in effect, this: "Before cock-crow thou shalt twice, yea, thrice (*i. e.*, repeatedly) deny me."

This is but one among many instances of the way in which the phenomena of the Old Testament may be applied to the interpretation of the New.

¹⁷ Clem. Alex., p. 556, οἱ μὲν εὐνουχίσαντες ἑαυτοὺς ἀπὸ πάσης ἀμαρτίας διὰ τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν μακάριοι οὗτοι εἰσιν οἱ τοῦ κόσμου νηστεύοντες. It should be noted that there (as in our Logion) the thought of "fasting from the world" is closely connected with "sabbatizing." In the word εὐνουχίσαντες Clement is referring to Is. 56:3-5 (previously, p. 555, quoted by him), where the eunuch is told that, if he keeps God's Sabbath, he need not call himself a "dry tree" (ξύλον ξηρόν).

This quotation was first pointed out by Dr. Joseph B. Mayor, the author of the well-known *Commentary on the Epistle of St. James*. It furnishes a clew to the whole of the Logia.

The verb "fast" is commonly used with an accusative of duration, "to fast during the Friday," etc. What, therefore, the grammar and the sense demand is some mystical doctrine about "fasting *during the six days* and sabbatizing the seventh." Take for example the following from the Apostolical Constitutions : ¹⁸ "He (the Lord) therefore exhorted us (the apostles) to fast during *these six days* ¹⁹ because of the impiety and sinfulness of the Jews . . . and to break our fast on the seventh day." It is true that the author of the Constitutions has in view the fasting in Easter week : but is it not possible that he may be literalizing a precept actually uttered by our Lord in a spiritual sense, "Fast through *the week*, sabbatize *the Sabbath*" ?

In using such words, Jesus may very well have had in view a distinction, current among his contemporaries and pervading the Pauline epistle, between "this world, or age" and "the world, or age, to come." It was natural to regard the six weekdays as corresponding to the former, and the seventh day, or Sabbath, as corresponding to the latter. The former was the time of trial, probation, and abstinence ; the latter was the participation in God's joy and rest, "eating bread in the kingdom of God." We may be quite sure that Jesus did not use the words in any temporal sense, either as meaning the six days of the literal week or as meaning the six ages of the temporal world preceding the seventh or Messianic age. It is consistent with all his doctrine that he should use the words spiritually, meaning that his disciples were not to fast merely on Tuesdays and Thursdays, as the Pharisees did, but, so to speak, *all through worldly time*, and that they were to sabbatize, not merely the seventh day, but *the whole of the Sabbath of God*, that is to say, *the whole of spiritual time*. The doctrine of Isaiah defined the nature of right "fasting." It consisted in abstinence from evil deeds. As to "sabbatizing," Christ's doctrine, as far as it may be inferred from his deeds, was that it consisted in the practice of loving beneficence — such "sabbatizing" as he assigned to the Father when he said, "My Father worketh hitherto and I work," ²⁰ just before he proceeded to heal the blind man on the Sabbath.

¹⁸ 5 : 15.¹⁹ τὰς ἡμέρας ταύτας.²⁰ John 5 : 17.

It will naturally be asked why, if this is the meaning, the Logia do not use the expression, "fast *during this age*" (τὸν αἰῶνα τούτου). The answer is as follows: The Hebrew for "world," in the expression "this world," as opposed to "the world to come," is "oulaum." *This may mean either "world" or "age."* Some Christian writers, as Hermas, render it almost always by αἰών ("æon" or "age"); others, as St. Paul, at times by αἰών, at times by κόσμος ("cosmos," or "world"); others, as St. John, never use αἰών in this sense, but only κόσμος.²¹ In their version of the Parable of the Sower, the two earliest gospels speak of "the cares of *the age*" (τοῦ αἰῶνος),²² as worldly influence that chokes the good seed. Luke, however, avoids this expression. If our Lord used the word *oulaum* in this saying, some writers might translate it by "the age," others by "the world." A writer in Egypt, following the usage of Philo, might naturally prefer to use the latter. It is true that thereby the translator lost the allusion to the sense of *duration*, which alone would strictly justify the accusative case in Greek; but, knowing as he did the convertibility of the words *cosmos* and *æon*, he might well feel that the temporal metaphor was sufficiently preserved by his retention of the accusative, while at the same time he might hope to save his readers from the danger of liberalism.

In fact, however, such a saying was certain to be interpreted

²¹So, too, generally (if not always), Clement of Alexandria. Perhaps both writers were influenced by Philo, who (I, 277, 619) taught that αἰών means *time in the divine sense*, so that it would not be regarded as transitory, sensuous, or connected with evil. (See Clem. Alex., p. 349.)

Similarly Barnabas opposes "this *world*" to "the holy *age*" (10:11): ὁ δίκαιος καὶ ἐν τούτῳ τῷ κόσμῳ περιπατεῖ καὶ τὸν αἰῶνα ἐκδέχεται. On the other hand, Tit. 2:12 (ἀρνησάμενοι . . . τὰς κοσμικὰς ἐπιθυμίας . . . εὐσεβῶς ζήσωμεν ἐν τῷ νῦν αἰῶνι) uses the two thoughts almost indifferently. What Titus 2:12 expresses by εὐσεβῶς . . . ἐν τῷ νῦν αἰῶνι, 2 Cor. 1:12 expresses by ἐν ἀγιότητι . . . ἀνεστράφημεν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ. Hermas repeatedly uses ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος. Ignatius speaks of the devil as (Eph. 19:1) τὸν ἀρχοντα τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου. Barnabas emphatically prefers another phrase (Barn. 18:1), ὁ μὲν (the Lord) ἐστὶν κύριος ἀπὸ αἰώνων καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, ὁ δὲ (the devil) ἀρχὼν καιροῦ τοῦ νῦν τῆς ἀνομίας.

²²Matt. 13:22; Mark 4:18.

literally. And the certainty is one proof of its genuineness. No writer, even in the first century, could have ventured (unless he were an anti-Pauline Judaizer, which is out of the question) to assign to Jesus the words, "sabbatize the Sabbath," without adding, as Justin Martyr does,²³ "the *true* Sabbath" or "the Sabbath of God," or "the *acceptable* Sabbath," or some qualification as an antidote against Jewish literalism. It is characteristic of Jesus himself that he freely uttered sayings literally inconsistent or hyperbolic;²⁴ but, after his time, if a writer used the word "sabbatize" without qualification, it would be, as in the epistle to the Hebrews, to show that (Hebr. 4 : 9) there *remained in the future* a "sabbatism" for the people of God, and this not a mere rest from labor, but a deliverance from sin. Or else a writer might maintain, in some other form, that the literal Sabbath was swallowed up in "the eighth day"—a name sometimes given by early Christian writers to Sunday, as being the first day of the second creation. Ignatius says, "no longer *sabbatizing*, but living *in accordance with the Lord's Day*" (κατὰ κυριακὴν ζῶντες).²⁵

That the doctrine of our Lord concerning fasting and sabbatizing caused difficulty to the very earliest disciples seems to be indicated both by frequent comments of Clement of Alexandria, which seem to play about this Logion, and by such passages as that in the Didache, or Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, where the writer bids the catechumen fast on Wednesday and Friday, and not on Monday and Thursday.²⁶ The same book contains the precept, "*fast* for them that persecute you."²⁷ In the saying, "This kind cometh not out but by prayer," many MSS. add, "and fasting."²⁸ And we have seen above that the

²³ *Tryph.*, § 12.

²⁴ "He that is not with me is against me," "He that is not against us is with us," "He that findeth his life shall lose it," "If a man hate not his father and mother," etc.

²⁵ *Magn.* ix. The books of the New Testament, after the Acts, make no other mention of the Sabbath except (Col. 2 : 16) to reject it.

²⁶ *Didach.* 8 : 1. Cf. *Didach.* 7 : 2-3, "For if thou canst bear the whole yoke of the Lord, thou wilt be perfect. But if thou canst not, do what thou canst. But, concerning food, bear what thou canst."

²⁷ *Didach.* 1 : 3.

²⁸ Mark 9 : 29.

Apostolic Constitutions speak of an injunction of the Lord himself to fast for six days before the day of his resurrection. The great mass of Christians probably found it difficult to reject the notion that the Lord enjoined fixed fasts, and to believe that his doctrine was rightly interpreted by Hermas,²⁹ "Offer to God a fasting of the following kind: Do no evil in your life, and serve the Lord with a pure heart. . . . If you do these things, you will keep a great fast, and one acceptable to God."³⁰ These two stages, the negative one of "doing no evil" and the positive of "serving the Lord with a pure heart," are implied by Isaiah's doctrine on the true fast³¹ and the true Sabbath,³² "cease to do evil, learn to do good"—words that form the basis of all the subsequent doctrine of Jesus and his more spiritual followers.

Justin Martyr, in answer to the complaint that Christians did not keep the feasts or the Sabbath, replies that "the New Law bids men sabbatize *perpetually*,"³³ and that he who ceases from evil has "*sabbatized the sweet and true Sabbath of God.*"³⁴ But Clement of Alexandria works out the doctrine far more fully. Fasting, he says, is, literally, abstinence from food, but, mystically, a sign that we must fast from the things of the world;³⁵ mere food makes us neither more righteous nor less, but we are to fast from the things of the world that we may die to the world, and that, afterwards, partaking of divine food, we may live to God. These words imply a feast following a fast, a feast in God's kingdom following a fast in the age of this present world. Clearly Clement does not mean that the feast is to be deferred till after death. Feast and fast alike are to take place in this present life.

Clement recognizes that there is a mystery in Christ's words,³⁶ "Then shall they fast in those days." He calls them

²⁹ *Simil.*, v, 1.

³¹ Isa. 58 : 3-6.

³² Isa. 1 : 13-16.

³⁰ Elsewhere Hermas bids his readers (*Sim.* 5 : 3) "reckon the price of the dishes you intended to have eaten, and give to the poor."

³³ *Tryph.*, § 12, σαββατίζειν ὑμᾶς ὁ καινὸς νόμος διὰ παντὸς ἐθέλει.

³⁴ τὰ τρυφερά καὶ ἀληθινὰ σάββατα τοῦ θεοῦ.

³⁵ Clem. Alex. (p. 992), ὅτι τῶν κοσμικῶν νηστεύειν χρή.

³⁶ Clem. Alex., p. 876, referring to Mark 2 : 20 ; Luke 5 : 35.

"enigmas," and declares that they do not refer to the customary fasts on Wednesday (sacred to Hermes), and on Friday (sacred to Aphrodite), but to a perpetual fast from evil. The transition is easy from the thought of "fasting" to the thought of Sunday or "Lord's day." Every day, says Clement, is converted into a Lord's day when a man casts away vile thoughts and takes to himself that conception of things which is engendered in us by faith in the resurrection accomplishing the commandment of the gospel (that is to say, the commandment of love). Such a man Clement calls a gnostic or "man of knowledge." Perhaps "man of insight" would express it better. It means insight into God's purposes of redemption derived from sympathy with them, and from harmony, or unity, with God. The gnostic, he says, supplies the place of the absent apostles by "removing the mountains" (*i. e.*, uprooting the sins) "of his neighbors."³⁷ The common believer, Clement admits, regards the mere abstinence from evil as being perfection, but the true gnostic advances to a higher stage of active and continuous beneficence after the likeness of God; and such as these, he says, are the true seed of Abraham.³⁸ All through these arguments Clement appears to have in view Christ's saying about the never-ceasing work of love on the part of the Father, as representing his Sabbath-feast ("My Father worketh hitherto and I work"); and this comes prominently forward in another passage where he says that "the Savior is ever saving and ever working, as he sees the Father doing. . . . Wherefore also the Lord hath not commanded us to *sabbatize* from good things, but to share them."³⁹

Reviewing these sayings of Clement, taken from passages not in one context, but distant from each other, we seem to see him constantly keeping in view the two stages of fasting and sabbatizing, and anxiously and repeatedly drawing out their spiritual meaning, as though he knew that the doctrine was misunderstood and perverted. If this was his feeling, it is easy to understand why he should modify the old phrase, "fast the world," into

³⁷ Clem. Alex., p. 878.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 770.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 323, reading, with Dr. Joseph B. Mayor, *κεκέλευκε* for *κεκώλυκε*.

"fast from the world," so as to avoid all danger of an interpretation that enjoined fasts during special times.

Returning to the Logion, we are enabled, by Clement's guidance, to see the twofold stage implied in "finding the kingdom" and "seeing the Father." The former is manifestly an inferior spiritual condition, revealing God as king. The latter implies that "purity of heart" which, in the Old Testament, is connected with "ascending into the hill of the Lord,"⁴⁰ and in the New Testament is repeatedly mentioned along with "love,"⁴¹ and in the Sermon on the Mount receives a special blessing, "Blessed are the *pure in heart*, for they shall *see God*." The form in which the blessing is described here ("see *the Father*") is another testimony to the early date of the saying. After the circulation of the fourth gospel (containing Christ's half rebuke to Philip, when the latter said, "Shew us the Father, and it sufficeth us"), it is not likely that any collector of Christ's sayings would have allowed this to pass unaltered, since, in appearance, it concedes to all the faithful a manifestation that the Lord denied to Philip.

VI. *The Logion on poverty*.—The next Logion (for there is hardly space for two Logia⁴²) runs as follows: "Saith Jesus, I [have] stood⁴³ in the midst of the world, and appeared unto them in the flesh, and found all men drunken and no man athirst among them; and my soul is weary over (*πονεί ἐπὶ*) the sons of men, because they are blind in their heart and . . . poverty" (*πτωχείαν*).

It is easy to discern a possible connection between the last and first words of this saying. In the Sermon on the Mount,

⁴⁰ Ps. 24 : 3-4. .

⁴¹ The connection is implied (John 13 : 5-35) in the cleansing that introduces the commandment, "Love one another." Cf. also 1 Tim. 1 : 5 ; 1 Pet. 1 : 22 ; James 1 : 27.

⁴² The facsimile represents only a line and a half as missing. And this is hardly sufficient to contain a new Logion about "poverty."

⁴³ The Greek aorist, in New Testament, often represents the English complete present with "have." Hence, *ἔστην*, *ᾤφθην*, *ἔδρον*, may all be represented in English with or without "have." If "have" is omitted, the saying would have to be regarded as a post-resurrection utterance; but the mention of Christ's "soul," *i. e.*, the animal or human nature, and the description of him as "weary" in the present, are against this view.

Jesus pronounces a blessing on the "poor" (πτωχοί), closely followed by a blessing on those who "hunger" and "thirst" after righteousness.⁴⁴ Here he seems to say that, though he stood in the midst of the "sons of men" as an example of "poverty" and "thirst," yet they remained self-satisfied—"drunken" and rich in their own eyes, filled with the food that pleased their passion.⁴⁵ Then, either continuing his warning to "the sons of men,"⁴⁶ he declares that they are really "poor;" or else, turning aside to exhort the disciples, he perhaps bids them retain the true "poverty" which insures his blessing. Clement gives us a definition that connects the true poverty with abstinence, or true fasting: "*Poverty consists in destitution of worldly passions.*"⁴⁷ Elsewhere⁴⁸ the same author describes the infatuation of the Jews in ignoring and persecuting Jesus, but not quite in the language of the Logion. A closer parallel may be found in one of the Sibylline poems, describing the Jews during the crucifixion as "drunken" and as "blinder than moles."⁴⁹

VII. *A disciple is never alone.*—In the next Logion several letters are missing at the commencement. As restored, in part, by Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt, it runs thus: "Saith Jesus, Wherever there are . . . gods and . . . is alone . . . I am with him. Raise the stone and there shalt thou find me. Cleave the tree⁵⁰ and I am there." The plural "gods" is nowhere

⁴⁴ Matt. 5:3, "poor in spirit;" Luke simply "poor."

⁴⁵ For the connection between spiritual "poverty" and spiritual "blindness," cf. Rev. 3:17: "Thou sayest, I am rich and have gotten riches and have need of nothing, and knowest not that thou art the wretched one and miserable and *poor* and *blind*." We cannot tell in the Logion whether the "poverty" is that of saints or that of sinners. But the former seems to suit the context better.

⁴⁶ This phrase is used in the gospels only in Mark 3:28, where it is probably correct. It is corrupted in the parallel Matt. 12:32; Luke 12:10. As often in the prophets and psalms, it represents men regarded as mortal, fallible, and frail.

⁴⁷ Reading κοσμικὰς for κοσμίαις in Clem. Alex., pp. 789-90, πένια δὲ ἡ κατὰ τὰς κοσμικὰς ἐπιθυμίας ἀπορία. Clement prefers the word πένια to πτωχεία, because the latter word, in classical Greek, suggests mendicancy.

⁴⁸ Clem. Alex., p. 214.

⁴⁹ Orac. Sibyll., I, 369-70, μεμεθυμένος . . . τυφλότεροι σπαλάκων.

⁵⁰ τὸ ξύλον cannot here mean "the wood." In the plural it may mean "wood;" and in the singular, without the article, or with the article and some defining adjective (as Lev. 14:6, τὸ ξύλον τὸ κέδρινον, "the *wood* of the cedar"), it may also have that

found in the gospels except in the fourth, where Jesus quotes from the Old Testament, "I said, ye are gods,"⁵¹ and adds that the Psalmist "called those gods to whom the word of God came." In this sense the plural might be used here, concerning those to whom the word of God is to be preached.

If this be the meaning, Clement throws light on it. For he twice⁵² quotes a saying exactly like that which the sense seems to

meaning. Of course this is also the case where the article is accompanied by a defining genitive (as 2 Sam. 21 : 19, "the *wood* of his spear"). Contrast 2 Kings 6 : 6, "he cut down a *stick*;" Ezra 6 : 11, "let a *beam* be pulled from his house."

But the Greek of the LXX naturally follows the Hebrew. And the regular meaning of the singular Hebrew noun is, (1) tree (or trees), (2) a stock, stump, post, or beam, used either as a gibbet (Gen. 40 : 19, etc.) or as a wooden idol (Habbak. 2 : 19; Isa. 45 : 20; Jer. 2 : 27; 3 : 9), or for some other purpose. The meaning and the ambiguity of the word are well brought out in Deut. 19 : 5, "When a man goeth into the forest . . . to hew *wood* (LXX, συναγαγεῖν ξύλα), and his hand fetcheth a stroke with the axe to cut down *the tree* (LXX, τὸ ξύλον), and the iron slippeth from the *tree*" (where R. V. has in text "helve," but in margin "tree": that is to say, the Hebrew word, being possibly defined by the preceding "axe," may mean "the wood (of the axe)," but it may also (and perhaps better) mean "the tree," and so the LXX (ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου) apparently takes it. In the fall of Adam ξύλον is regularly used to mean "tree," *e. g.*, in Gen. 3 : 12, "She gave me of the *tree*" (τοῦ ξύλου). In 2 Chron. 7 : 13 "locusts" are said to eat (LXX) τὸ ξύλον, *i. e.*, "the trees of the field," (Heb. "eat the land." The prophets habitually join τὸ ξύλον with τὸν λίθον to mean "the stock" and "the stone" used in idolatry, as in Habbak. 2 : 19, "woe unto him that saith unto the stock (R. V., "the wood," τῷ ξύλῳ), Awake, to the dumb stone (LXX, simply τῷ λίθῳ), Arise." Compare a preceding verse (*ibid.*, 2 : 11) "the stone (λίθος, *without the article*) shall cry out of the wall, and the beam out of *the timber* (ξύλου, *without the article*) shall answer it." The two passages show that the LXX here distinguished between ξύλον, an ordinary piece of "timber," and τὸ ξύλον, "the stock" used by an idolater. So Jer. 2 : 27, "(They) say to a *stock* (τῷ ξύλῳ), Thou art my father, and to a *stone* (τῷ λίθῳ), Thou hast brought me forth," and similarly, *ibid.*, 3 : 9, τὸ ξύλον καὶ τὸν λίθον.

There is probably no instance in the LXX, and certainly none in the N. T., where τὸ ξύλον, used absolutely, means "wood." According to the rules given above, it might possibly mean "wood" in Luke 23 : 31, but it is better translated (R. V.) "the green *tree*."

These considerations suggest at the outset that τὸ ξύλον here means the stock or stump of some useless tree, possibly with a play on the meaning of lifelessness and helplessness conveyed by its association with "stone."

⁵¹ John 10 : 34.

⁵² Clem. Alex., p. 374 (introduced by φησι), and p. 466. In the latter passage this recognition of God is regarded as higher than the self-knowledge advocated by the Greek proverb, "Know thyself." It is preceded by a statement that the true Christian has the power of spiritual healing, and it is followed by an exposition of the doctrine of love.

demand here, "Thou hast seen thy brother, thou hast seen thy God." And the context, in at least one of these two passages, like the context here, appears intended to stimulate the Christian to the exercise of the art of spiritual healing, or conversion, bestowed on him by the Master for the redemption of mankind. Unfortunately the Logion is so mutilated at this point that any full restoration of it with absolute certainty is almost impossible.⁵³ But it may be pointed out that (1) what the sense demands is "wherever *men* are, there are gods;" (2) the word for "men" is found in the former part of the papyrus spelt with the contraction common in early MSS., $\overline{\text{ANOI}}$ (for $\text{AN}\Theta\text{P}\Omega\text{ΠOI}$); (3) if the reader will refer to the facsimile of the Logion, he will find that there is just room for $\overline{\text{ANOI}}$ before the ϵ indicated by the Oxford editors in line 24; (4) after the ϵ there appears to be room for KEI KAI , thus making the whole sentence $\overline{\delta\pi\omicron\upsilon\epsilon\lambda\alpha\nu\delta\sigma\iota\nu\alpha\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\iota\epsilon\kappa\epsilon\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\theta\epsilon\omicron\iota}$, "wherever there are men, there also there are gods."

This thought suits well with a sequel showing that a Christian engaged in his Master's work is "never alone because the Master is with him."⁵⁴ On this point Clement of Alexandria will again

⁵³ 23. $[\text{AET}] \text{EI} [\overline{\text{I}\Sigma} \text{OII}] \text{OT EAN } \Omega\text{ΣIN}$

24. $[\dots] \text{E}[\dots] \dots \Theta\text{EOI KAI}$

25. $[\dots] \Sigma\text{O} \dots \text{E} [\dots] \text{E}\Sigma\text{TIN MONO}\Sigma$

26. $[\dots] \text{T}\Omega \text{E}\Gamma\Omega\text{EIMI METAT}$

27. $\text{T}[\text{OT}]$.

I venture to restore some of the missing letters in line 24 thus:.

$\text{OIIOT EAN } \Omega\text{ΣIN } [\overline{\text{ANOI}}] \text{E}[\text{KEI KAI}] \Theta\text{EOI}$

As in line 38, KAI may be so compressed as to occupy the space of only two letters.

As regards line 25, the Oxford editors add that the first Σ may be the end of II . Adopting the latter alternative, we may conjecturally restore the line thus:

$[\text{OII}] \text{O}[\text{T}] \text{E}[\text{I}\Sigma] \text{E}\Sigma\text{TIN MONO}\Sigma$

i. e., "wherever one is alone," or "wherever there is one alone."

In line 26, $[\dots] \text{T}\Omega$ might represent $[\text{I}\Sigma] \text{T}\Omega$, "let him know," used parenthetically. The construction is not found in N. T. But ἵστε is used somewhat similarly in James 1:19. The Oxford editors give II as an alternative for T in $[\dots] \text{T}\Omega$. If this represented $[\text{TO}] \text{II}\Omega$, the original might be something to this effect, "in whatever place one is alone." Professor Harnack suggests $[\text{OT}] \text{T}\Omega$ as the first word, but ἐγώ would require οὐτως before it, not οὐτῶ .

⁵⁴ Cf. John 16:32, "And yet I am not alone because the Father is with me."

supply us with an illustration. In a long passage he describes the ideal gnostic, at work in his Master's vineyard, planting, pruning,⁵⁵ and watering. Then (after inculcating the spiritual "fasting" ⁵⁶ above described) he declares that "this gnostic supplies the place of the apostles, overturning the mountains of his neighbors."⁵⁷ Jesus bade his disciples resort to faith and prayer if they wished to "cast down mountains" and "uproot fig trees."⁵⁸ So, here, Clement passes to the subject of prayer. And he adds that the true gnostic is not left to himself when he prays: "*Even if he pray alone, he hath the choir of the saints on his side.*"⁵⁹ It must be admitted that Clement does not expressly say here that the gnostic in his Lord's vineyard has the Lord at his side; but he has just before implied this, when, in describing the highest kind of gnostic, he speaks of him as "glorifying that resurrection of the Lord which has taken place in his own soul," and as "thinking that *he sees the Lord when he sees the truth.*"⁶⁰ "Seeing the truth," according to Clement's view, implies doing the truth, that is to say, doing God's will; and he that does the Father's

⁵⁵ Clem. Alex., p. 876, κλαδεύων. Like John (15:2), Clement appears generally, if not always, to prefer the metaphor of "pruning" to that of "uprooting." But he speaks of "cutting out," or "exterminating" (ἐκκόπτειν, a word often used of cutting down trees) the passion of the soul (p. 875, ἐκκόψαι τὸ τῆς ψυχῆς πάθος).

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 877, νηστεύει φιλαργυρίας τε καὶ φιληδονίας, ἐξ ὧν αἱ πᾶσαι ἐκφύονται κακίαι. This really implies a "cutting down" to the very roots of avarice and luxury.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 878, τὰ ὄρη μεθίστας τῶν πλησίων καὶ τὰς τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτῶν ἀνωμαλίας ἀποβάλλων. This is one of many places where Clement avoids — when we might naturally expect him to insert — our Lord's companion-metaphor of the uprooting of sycamine trees, or the cutting down of fig trees. Perhaps he felt that "pruning" (κλαδεύειν) expressed the same thing more gently.

⁵⁸ Matt. 17:20; 21:21, "Ye shall not only do the [deed] of the fig tree, but even if ye say to this mountain," etc. Luke 17:6 speaks of the "uprooting" of a "sycamine tree." But Matt. 21:21 refers to the miracle of the withering of the fig tree assumed to have recently taken place. All these metaphors refer to the effort needed for eradicating sin.

⁵⁹ Clem. Alex., p. 879. In the context he reiterates the twofold stage above mentioned: "Fear causes abstinence from evil. Love leads men to do good, building them up to that which is voluntary" (ἐποικοδομοῦσα εἰς τὸ ἐκούσιον).

⁶⁰ It must be borne in mind that the *gnosis*, or knowledge, of Clement's gnostic is not a mere intellectual or evidential knowledge, but such a sympathetic insight into the Father's will as brings with it a power to do the Father's works, healing the souls of men.

will is not alone, because the Son is with him. Without exactly using the phrases "not alone" and "finding Christ," Clement certainly agrees with the thought when he tells us that the Christian praying in solitude for his neighbors has the angels with him, and Christ in his soul, and the Lord before his eyes.

Such a doctrine is a natural supplement to Christ's post-resurrectional utterance to the apostles: "Go ye, therefore, and make disciples of all the nations . . . and lo, I am with you always, even to the end of the world."⁶² This differed from the earlier statement: "Whosoever *two or three* are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them."⁶² The latter seemed to demand at least "two or three," and to exclude "one." The former implied that all laborers in the vineyard, *singly as well as collectively*, should have the presence of the Master, in accordance with the very ancient appendix to Mark's gospel: "They went forth and preached everywhere, *the Lord working with them.*"⁶³ But though it *implied* the blessing on "one," it did not *mention* "one." The very early commentary of Ephraemus Syrus⁶⁴ refers to a traditional saying that not only where there are two or three, but "where there is one" present in Christ's name, Christ is with him, and the Homilies of Aphraates⁶⁵ refer to Moses, Jonah, and Elijah as instances of the truth of a similar saying. It is a doctrine so true and simple that we may well be surprised that it has not received prominence in patristic references and comments. Perhaps, however, it was subordinated, or avoided, as being liable to abuse by some who "forsook the assembling of themselves together,"⁶⁶ and who did not perceive that the Logion, far from encouraging otiose contemplation, expressly limited the divine presence to those disciples who were working for the redemption of souls: "Where two or three are present in my name and doing my will, I am with them. Yea, *where there is one alone, I am with him.*"

VIII. *The stone and the tree.*—At this point we are confronted

⁶² Matt. 28:19-20.

⁶² Matt. 18:20.

⁶³ Mark 16:20.

⁶⁴ P. 165. There, however, the application is to a sinner wandering like a lost sheep.

⁶⁵ Aphr., *Hom.*, p. 62.

⁶⁶ Heb. 10:25.

with difficulties of expression that must not be cursorily passed by. Granting that the Lord is present with those who are doing his work, how is that work defined by the curious expressions "raising the stone" and "cleaving the tree"? It may be annoying to have to turn aside to verbal questions, but such a digression is absolutely necessary for the thorough study of the words. To say, as some may feel disposed to say, "The general drift is clear; it means that Jesus promised to be present with the mason and the carpenter, and (by implication) with every disciple engaged in his ordinary occupation," is simply to give up all prospect of honestly entering into the Lord's meaning. For when did the Lord ever make such a promise? How, indeed, could he make it to men whom he was sending forth to convert the world and urging to give all their energies to sowing the seed of the gospel and to plowing its fields, or to shepherding the flock and bringing back the lost sheep, or to laboring in the vineyard by digging and gathering out the stones and cutting down the trees and rooting up the weeds and erecting a tower and planting and pruning the vines? The mere mention of all these actions, "sowing," "planting," "cutting down," "rooting up," is enough to remind us that Jesus always used these, and other, similar words, metaphorically, and could not (so far as we can judge) have used them in a literal sense.

The way being up-hill, we must go step by step. And the first step is to ascertain what Clement (our trusty guide so far) has to say about "stones and trees" from the Christian point of view. According to him, they are "the senseless;"⁶⁷ and he explains the saying that "God can raise up from these stones children to Abraham" as referring to men "*petrified*"⁶⁸ in relation to truth." God, he says, has actually thus made men out of stones; they have, as it were, risen from the dead.⁶⁹ Clement does not actually use the word "stones" as the grammatical object of "raise." But Origen does, when he speaks of the stones themselves as "able to be *raised up* (*ἐγερθῆναι*) [*as*] *children* to Abra-

⁶⁷ Clem. Alex., p. 4, οἱ ἀφρονες.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, λελιθωμένον.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 5. It is to be observed that in this passage Clement speaks of the "stones" as *converted into men* (ἀνθρώπους ἐκ λίθων . . . πεποίηκεν).

ham."⁷⁰ Ignatius, and (in much fuller detail) Hermas,⁷¹ speak of the raising up of stones so as to build a tower of the Lord.

From these Christian traditions we pass (before discussing any kindred saying in the gospel) to pre-Christian doctrine on "the raising up of stones." The exact phrase is not found in the Old Testament, but there are similar ones. Jacob is described as setting up a stone for a pillar,⁷² and there are mystical traditions about this act among both Jewish and Christian writers.⁷³ But this stone, like that in Daniel, and like the Psalmist's "head-stone of the corner," was regarded as the Messiah, and no Messianic type seems to apply here. We need some passage that describes the raising of stones in the quarry, or from the rough, uncleared land, for the purpose of erecting a wall or tower for a vineyard or a house for the Master's use. No such passage (including the two Greek words used here) exists in the Septuagint. But the well-known Song of the Vineyard in Isaiah⁷⁴ speaks of the Master as not only digging it, but also clearing it of stones, and as building a tower in it: and the stones would presumably be employed in building the "tower" and the walls round the vineyard. There is no mention of uprooting weeds or bushes, or of cutting down useless trees; but such work would often be a necessary part of the labor of preparing fresh land for culture.

Here it may be noted that the LXX, apparently not understanding the Hebrew word "stone"⁷⁵ in the Isaiah passage,

⁷⁰ Orig., *Comm. Johann.* (ed. HUET (1668), Vol. II, 120), τοὺς προειρημένους λίθους δεικνυμένους ἀκούουσι δύνασθαι ἐγερθῆναι τέκνα τῷ Ἀβραάμ.

⁷¹ Hermas, *Simil.*, ix. In Ign., *Eph.*, § 9, the cross is a crane, the spirit a rope, faith a windlass. He is describing, not an apostle's work, but the task of each Christian to "raise," as it were, his own "stone." But the elaborate metaphor points to an original basis of tradition about "raising the stone." Cf. 1 Peter 2:5, "ye also as living stones."

⁷² Gen. 28:18, ἐποίησεν αὐτὸν στήλην.

⁷³ SCHÖTTGEN, Vol. II, 605 (and cf. Vol. II, 101). Justin, after mentioning Jacob's stone as anointed with oil, says (*Tryph.*, § 86) "that the stone is Christ (χριστός, "anointed") was proclaimed symbolically by many scriptures."

⁷⁴ Isa. 5:2.

⁷⁵ It is used as here in Isa. 62:10, "stone it from stones" (τοὺς λίθους ἐκ τῆς ὁδοῦ διαπρίψατε). But it generally means "pelt with stones," as in Ex. 19:13; 2 Sam. 16:6.

renders it "staked" (*ἐχαράκωσα*), *i. e.*, planted it with stakes for the vines to climb on. Such a misunderstanding may have influenced western translators of our Logion, and may have conduced to its being dropped as obscure.⁷⁶

In the only passage of the Old Testament (Eccles. 10: 8-10) that connects the "cleaving of trees" (*σχίζων ξύλα*) with "quarrying" or "removal" of stones, it is doubtful whether the writer means ordinary occupation or malicious mischief-working: "He that diggeth a pit shall fall into it; and whoso breaketh through a fence, a serpent shall bite him. Whoso *herweth out* (or, removeth⁷⁷) stones shall be hurt therewith; and he that *cleaveth trees* (or, wood⁷⁸) is endangered thereby. If the iron be blunt, and one do not whet the edge, then must he put to more strength; but wisdom is profitable to direct." On the whole, the writer is probably saying, not without a touch of cynicism, that every labor has its risks, while adding that wisdom may shorten toil and suggesting that wisdom may also diminish danger. This passage may well have been in our Lord's mind. Solomon had warned the rustic, toiling to prepare the ground for the crop, that he was in perpetual danger: Jesus declares to the laborers whom he is sending forth to prepare the field for the spiritual harvest that they are under perpetual protection.⁷⁹

⁷⁶ Hermas (*Simil.*, v, 2) represents the Lord as bidding his servant merely "stake" (*χαράκων*) the vineyard. But the faithful servant, after "staking" it, does extra work, digging the soil and clearing away weeds. One might have supposed that the "stoning," at least in some districts, would be the first work, then the digging up and weeding, or uprooting of trees, and lastly the staking.

Hermas agrees with Clement in his view of the weeds or plants (*βοράναι*) that are plucked out. They are not sinners. They are (Herm., *Simil.*, v, 15) "the sins (*ἀνομιαι*) of the servants of God."

⁷⁷ The Hebrew word is used in 1 Kings 5: 17 for "quarrying." It is also used of "plucking up" tent pegs, and may very well be applied to wrenching up stones imbedded in the earth. The LXX has *ἐξάλπειν* in Eccles. 10: 9, *αἴρειν* in 1 Kings 5: 17.

⁷⁸ R. V. "wood." But (1) the Hebrew may mean either "wood" or "tree;" (2) the processes described appear to be agricultural, and the context points to wood-cutting, not carpentry; (3) for the plural meaning "trees," *cf.* Justin Martyr (*Tryph.*, § 86) *κόψαι ξύλα*, where (2 Kings 6: 5) a man is apparently felling a tree by the water's side. The Hebrew word "split" or "cleave" may include the use of the wedge.

⁷⁹ Somewhat similarly Jesus appears to have spiritualized another materialistic

Now, coming to the gospels, we have to ask whether, in them, "cleaving trees" and "raising up stones" are connected together in any sense that may harmonize with all the above-mentioned traditions and also throw light on our Logion. The teaching of the Baptist will occur to many as supplying a parallel. The Jews are addressed by him as trees destined to be cut down unless they bring forth fruit; and the same passage speaks of "children of Abraham" as able to be raised up from "stones."⁸⁰ Perhaps John was actually standing amid the objects of which he speaks—large stones imbedded in the earth, useless bushes and trees cumbering the ground, the former demanding to be "lifted" into walls and buildings where they might help instead of hindering the agriculturist, the latter demanding to be cut down, hewn to pieces, and burned, since they were unfit for any other purpose. In any case, we can well understand that such doctrine, deeply impressed on the Baptist's disciples and taken up by Jesus, may have found expression in such a saying as our papyrus has preserved. If so, the meaning of it is, in effect: "Raise up the fallen soul and place it as a living stone, in the tower of the vineyard. Cut down and cleave the barren bushes and trees of hypocrisy, malignity, avarice, and selfishness. Wherever thou art doing this, either in thine own heart, or among the sons of men, there am I present with thee."⁸¹

IX. *The remaining Logia.*—The two next Logia, and probably the fragment of the last, all turn on the duty of a missionary.

passage of Ecclesiastes (11 : 5): "As thou knowest not the *way of the wind* (or, *spirit*), nor how the bones do grow in the womb of her that is with child, even so thou knowest not the work of God who doth all." In the dialogue with Nicodemus about "the way of the Spirit," these words are adapted to the doctrine of spiritual generation. So to the following words (11 : 6, "In the morning sow thy seed, and in the evening withhold not thine hand: for thou knowest not which shall prosper") appear to be applied by Jesus spiritually in the parable of the sower.

⁸⁰ The Hebrew for "*of* (*ek*) these stones" might very well have a partitive meaning indicating that "(some of) the stones" themselves are to be raised up, as Clement of Alexandria implies and Origen asserts.

⁸¹ Somewhat similar is the commission given to the prophet Jeremiah (1 : 8-10): "*I am with thee to deliver thee . . . I have set thee . . . to pluck up and break down . . . to build and to plant.*"

The first is : "Saith Jesus, a prophet is not acceptable in his own country ; neither doth a physician work cures on them that know him."

The former part of this Logion is found in all the canonical gospels,⁸² but only two of them (Mark and Luke) connect it with the mention of a "physician" or "cures." Mark says that Jesus in his own country could do no mighty works, save that he healed a few sick folk ; Luke represents Jesus as saying to his fellow-townsmen in Nazareth, "Doubtless ye will say unto me this parable, 'Physician, heal thyself ; whatsoever we have heard done at Capernaum do also here in thine own country,'" where there is a reference to miracles of healing wrought at Capernaum.

No one can assert that a physician, in the literal sense, "does not work cures on them that know him." Jesus is, therefore, manifestly speaking of a physician of the soul and of nothing but spiritual healing. In this sense, familiarity with the healer is well known as an impediment to the act of healing. The synoptists hint at it in various ways—"Is not this Joseph's son?"⁸³ "Is not this the carpenter, the son of Mary and brother of James and Joses and Judas and Simon?"⁸⁴ But it is reserved for John to represent the Jews as saying directly that they cannot believe in any Messiah whose origin they "know,"⁸⁵ and Jesus as replying in two apparently inconsistent statements, "Ye both *know* me and know whence I am," and again, "Ye *know* neither me nor my Father."⁸⁶ The meaning of both is obvious. The hero is "known," and yet "not known," by the valet who despises him. The prophet is "known," and yet "not known," by the neighbors whom he cannot heal because they cannot believe. Most appropriately does this Logion come here as an utterance to apostles and teachers who, having been assured of their Master's helpful presence wherever they may

⁸² Matt. 13 : 57 ; Mark 6 : 4 ; Luke 4 : 24 ; John 4 : 44. The Logion agrees most closely with Luke.

⁸³ Luke 4 : 22.

⁸⁴ Mark 6 : 3.

⁸⁵ John 7 : 27 : "We *know* whence this man cometh : but when the Christ cometh, no man knoweth whence he is.

⁸⁶ John 7 : 28 ; 8 : 19.

go on his service, are now urged to set forth to unknown places and not to remain in their homes.⁸⁷

The next Logion combines two sayings from the Sermon on the Mount : "Saith Jesus, a city built⁸⁸ on the top of a high hill, and stablished, can neither fall nor be hid."⁸⁹ It warns the Christian teacher, first, that he is to teach, and, secondly, that he is to know. Publicity is to be accompanied with certainty. The tower is to be high, but it is also to have firm foundations. The two thoughts go well together in this antithesis, and their harmony indicates that we have here an original saying of Jesus, or of some early inspired follower of Jesus, and not a mere scribal combination of two sayings. And there is a passage of Clement of Alexandria, similarly connecting the notions of "height" and "stablishing," which makes it probable that this Logion was in some shape known to him. Quoting the Psalmist's precept to "tell the towers" of Jerusalem, he says : "This suggests that those who in a *high spirit* (ὕψηλως) have received the word [of God] will be like *high towers* and will stand *firmly* in faith and knowledge."⁹⁰

Here we come to an end of the continuously legible MS. Concerning the two fragmentary and obscure lines that remain, all that we can say is that what the sense demands is some saying carrying on the antithesis between publishing on high and believing in the depth of the heart. Such a saying might be expressed in some shape of the well-known words : "What ye

⁸⁷ Clem. Alex. (p. 466) mentions spiritual "healing" (ἰασις) as part of the duty of the true gnostic.

⁸⁸ Matt. 5 : 14, with a phrase from Matt. 7 : 27. Matt. 5 : 14 has *κειμένη*, "situated ;" but (say the Oxford editors) the Arabic Diatessaron and Syriac versions have "built."

⁸⁹ πόλις οἰκοδομημένη ἐπ' ἄκρον [δ]ρους ὑψηλοῦ καὶ ἐστηρικμένη οὔτε πε[σ]εῖν δύναται οὔτε κρυ[β]ῆναι. "The scribe," so say the Oxford editors, "certainly wrote ΤΨΗΛΟΤΣ, but he appears to have partially rubbed out the Σ." This, and the error αὐ for ω in οἰκοδομημένη, appear to indicate an illiterate scribe.

⁹⁰ Clem. Alex., p. 883, quoting Ps. 48 : 12. This suggests that our Logion may have read originally ὑψηλως, which was first corrupted into ὑψηλοῦς, and then corrected to ὑψηλοῦ. Elsewhere a similar adverb is used by Clement in connection with Christ's saying about "hearing with the ear" (Clem. Alex., p. 802), ὁ δὲ ἀκούετε εἰς τὸ οὖς [κηρύξατε] . . . [ὑψηλόρως] παραδίδόντες.

hear in the ear that proclaim on the housetop.”⁹¹ And a very slight alteration indeed of the edited text might give this meaning.⁹²

X. *Conclusion*.—A review of these “Sayings of Jesus” as a whole strengthens the impression that they are not Judaistic or gnostic inventions, but approximate representations of words actually uttered by our Lord. They are far deeper and more spiritual than any of the gnostic utterances assigned to him in the Pistis Sophia, or even in the Acts of John. Nor do they show, when carefully examined, any signs of a Judaizing hand. They have a continuity and rhythm that imply, not a mere compiler, but an inspired disciple. They are pervaded with the thought that the business of the true Christian is to save the souls of others. Free from controversial allusions, obscure but deep, liable to misunderstanding, yet capable of being understood in the purest spiritual sense, the two most important of the new Logia are precisely such as Christ himself might have uttered, and such as the orthodox church might have been forced to explain and tempted to subordinate or ignore. The remarkable parallelisms found in Clement of Alexandria to almost all the new Logia supply a special confirmation of their genuineness. If Egypt was the place of their publication, it was natural that an Egyptian writer would show most traces of them. If he knew or suspected them to be forgeries, we might expect in him some traces of an antagonistic feeling towards them. But his allusions, not apologetic, but explanatory, are such as might be expected from a sympathetic writer, assuming their truth and

⁹¹ Matt. 10: 27, *ὃ εἰς τὸ οὖς ἀκούετε, κηρύξατε ἐπὶ τῶν δωματίων.*

⁹² The Oxford editors give

41. ΛΕΓΕΙ ἸΣ ΑΚΟΤΕΙΣ

42. [.]ΙΣΤΟΕ . . ΤΙΟΝ ΣΟΤ ΤΟ

But they add that some letters in line 42 are (p. 15) “very faint. The third letter could be Γ, the fifth Σ. [Ε]ΙΣ ΤΟ ΕΝΩΗΙΟΝ ΣΟΤ is a possible reading. The last letter of the line may be Ε, and the preceding one Γ or conceivably Κ.”

Now after the Σ in ἸΣ, in line 41, an Ο might easily be dropped (a common error in MSS.), and there is just room in line 42 for ΕΙΣ ΤΟΤΑΡΙΟΝΣΟΤΤΟ (the form *ῶτάριον* is used in John). This would give *ὃ ἀκούεις εἰς τὸ ῶτάριόν σου το[ῦτο] κήρυξον ἐπὶ τῶν δωματίων*], “What thou hearest in the ear, this do thou proclaim on the housetop.”

genuineness, but aware of their obscurity and liability to perversion. Lastly, these Logia combine, in a way by no means characteristic of a mere imitator, the antithetical style of parts of the synoptic gospels with touches that remind us of the Johannine gospel—the thought of “seeing the Father,”⁹³ the representation of Jesus as describing his attitude to “the world,”⁹⁴ the impossibility that a true disciple can ever be “alone,”⁹⁵ and the impediment presented by so-called “knowledge” of the healer to the exercise of the art of spiritual healing.⁹⁶

And perhaps this is our greatest gain from the Logia of Behnesa, namely, a fresh glimpse of a person behind our four canonical gospels, a person surpassing his biographers even further than we had supposed. Not that we ought not to be grateful for the new utterances in themselves, full as they are of beautiful and stimulating truth. We are familiar with the duty of ever “dying to the world,” which is inculcated in the Logion about “fasting ;” but we need also to remind ourselves that we must ever be “sabbatizing the Sabbath” of God’s beneficent love. We need to be warned, in this restless, discontented age, that our Master intends us to be “athirst” and “poor,” and that such poverty is better than the self-complacent intoxication of pleasure. That where there are men to be helped, there “there are gods ;” that the single-handed soldier of Christ is never “alone ;” that every disciple is to do his utmost to “raise the stone,” useless and harmful where it lies, to its useful place in Christ’s tower, and to “cleave” and cut down “the tree” of error ; and that this aggressive action is to be carried on with all prominence, and with a height of confidence proportioned to the depth of our faith—all these are in themselves “comfortable sayings” that constitute a permanent possession for Christians. But, far beyond these results, gainful though they are, is the new and hopeful insight that we derive from them into a Lord and Master to whom neither the fourth gospel from the divine point of view, nor the synoptic gospels from the human point of view, have been able to do adequate justice. With this insight

⁹³ John 6 : 46 ; 14 : 9.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, 16 : 32.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, 8 : 12 ; 9 : 39, etc.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, 7 : 27, 28 ; 8 : 19.

there should come also a feeling, not of regret that the evangelists have done so little, but of gratitude that they have done so much. If one and the same Jesus is depicted—we may not feel able to say, with historic accuracy, but with an attempt at spiritual faithfulness—by the synoptic and Johannine evangelists, how wonderfully many-sided must he have been, how impossible to delineate in writing! With fresh conviction may we repeat the words of the fourth evangelist that, if biographers attempted to express the spirit of Jesus in words, “even the world itself would not contain the books that should be written.”